

DIRECT TESTIMONY

of

DENNIS L. SWEATMAN

Senior Rate Analyst
Rates Department
Financial Analysis Division
Illinois Commerce Commission

Approval of Delivery Services Tariffs
and Delivery Services Implementation Plan
Central Illinois Light Company

Docket Nos. 01-0465/01-0530/01-0637
(Consolidated)

November 28, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	WITNESS QUALIFICATION.....	1
II.	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY	3
III.	DELINEATION OF TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES.....	5
IV.	OVERVIEW OF CILCO'S DST COST STUDY METHODOLOGY.....	11
V.	FUNCTIONAL ALLOCATION	14
VII.	RATE DESIGN	20
	A. Description	20
	B. Recommendations	23
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS	28

SCHEDULES

- 1 – CILCO WP C-2 – Docket No. 01-0465
- 2 – Electric General and Common Plant Comparison 1997-2000 – Docket No. 01-0465
- 3 – CILCO Rate Design Component Format – Revised – Docket No. 01-0637
- 4 – CILCO Meter Support Worksheet – Revised – Docket No. 01-0637
- 5 – CILCO Revised Exhibit 2.9 – Revised – Docket No. 01-0637

ATTACHMENTS

- 1 – CILCO Response to Staff Data Request DLS-11
- 2 – CILCO Response to Staff Data Request DLS-13
- 3 – CILCO Response to Staff Data Request DLS-14

1 **I. WITNESS QUALIFICATION**

2 Q. Please state your name and business address.

3 A. Dennis L. Sweatman, 527 East Capitol Avenue, Springfield, Illinois 62701.

4

5 Q. What is your present position with the Illinois Commerce Commission?

6 A. My present position is Senior Rate Analyst in the Rates Department of the
7 Financial Analysis Division. In that position, I review and analyze tariff filings by
8 electric, gas, and water utilities with regard to cost of service and rate design. I
9 make recommendations to the Commission on such filings and participate in
10 docketed proceedings as assigned. Currently, I am assigned to evaluate the
11 cost of service and rate design aspects of Central Illinois Light Company's
12 (CILCO) proposed delivery services tariffs, filed October 3, 2001, and November
13 9, 2001.

14

15 Q. Please state your professional qualifications and work experience.

16 A. I received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from Augustana College
17 and a Master of Arts degree in Public Administration from the University of Illinois
18 - Springfield (formerly Sangamon State University). Prior to assuming my current
19 position within the Financial Analysis Division in December 1997, I served as
20 Director of the Commission's Economic Development Program, starting in 1986.
21 As part of my responsibilities in that capacity, I conducted analyses of economic
22 development issues and completed evaluations of special electric and gas rate
23 structures primarily designed for economic development and load retention

24 purposes. From 1992 to December 1997, I was also Assistant Manager of the
25 Energy Programs Division. Prior to December 1986, I was employed by the City
26 of Springfield, Illinois, as Manager of Economic Development. In that capacity, I
27 was responsible for structuring economic development financing and incentive
28 packages, preparing applications for state and federal program assistance, and
29 administering the various economic development programs of the City of
30 Springfield.

31
32 Q. Have you testified in any previous Commission dockets?

33 A. Yes. I prepared testimony in Docket No. 89-0276 (Illinois Power) on the subject
34 of economic development/incentive rates. I also prepared testimony in Docket
35 No. 92-0270 (Central Illinois Public Service) regarding the economic
36 development aspects of utilities' strategic load growth programs. I also submitted
37 testimony in Docket No. 93-0425 (Commonwealth Edison) concerning the
38 Commission's evaluation criteria related to load retention rate structures. I
39 prepared testimony in Docket No. 94-0134 (Illinois Power) in regard to the
40 appropriateness of using utility discounted rate structures to compete for
41 municipal customers. I submitted testimony in Docket Nos. 98-0348 (Illinois
42 Power), 98-0349 (MidAmerican Energy), and 98-0362 (Commonwealth Edison)
43 related to real-time pricing issues and compliance of filed tariffs with Section 16-
44 107 of the Public Utilities Act. I prepared testimony in Docket No. 98-0546
45 (AmerenUE) in regard to cost of service and rate design issues. I submitted
46 testimony in Docket Nos. 99-0119/99-0131, consolidated (CILCO) and 99-

0122/99-0130, consolidated (MidAmerican Energy Company) in regard to cost of service and rate design issues related to delivery services tariffs (DST) filed pursuant to Section 16-108 of the Public Utilities Act. In Docket No. 99-0013, I prepared testimony in regard to cost of service and rate design issues related to unbundling of non-residential electric DST for CILCO and MidAmerican Energy Company. I also submitted testimony in Docket Nos. 00-0620/00-0621, consolidated (Nicor Gas) regarding cost justification for supplier charges under the Customer Select Program. In Docket Nos. 01-0469 and 01-0470 (North Shore Gas and Peoples Gas), I prepared testimony in regard to savings associated with reduced gas storage inventory. In Docket No. 01-0444, I submitted testimony in regard to cost of service and rate design issues related to residential DST filed by MidAmerican Energy Company.

II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

Q. What is the subject matter of your testimony?

A. My testimony presents the results of my analyses of CILCO's proposed delineation of transmission and distribution (T&D) facilities and CILCO's DST cost of service study and rate design proposals.

67 Q. How is your testimony organized?

68 A. First, I address CILCO's delineation of transmission and distribution facilities, as
69 filed in Docket No. 01-0465. Second, in regard to Docket No. 01-0637, I review
70 a) CILCO's functional cost study which allocates the totals from each Federal
71 Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) account to functional categories related
72 to distribution and to DST customer classes; b) CILCO's calculation of revenue
73 requirements for DST customer classes; and c) CILCO's proposed rate design
74 for DST customer classes. In addition to comparing CILCO's proposed
75 methodology with the approach approved in Docket Nos. 99-0119/99-0131,
76 consolidated (CILCO's 1999 non-residential DST proceeding), I also make
77 recommendations for modifications to CILCO's proposals.

78

79 Q. Please summarize the results of your analyses.

80 A. In regard to Docket No. 01-0465, I recommend that CILCO's No. 9170000
81 common plant accounts be allocated to gas and electric on the same basis as
82 other CILCO service centers. CILCO agrees with my recommendations. I also
83 recommend the use of a different allocator to allocate general plant costs to
84 distribution. In regard to Docket No. 01-0637, the results of my analyses indicate
85 that revisions are needed to CILCO's cost of service study and rate design
86 proposals. My recommendations result in different DST rates than proposed by
87 CILCO. The primary differences are related to my recommendation to recover
88 costs associated with the Customer Meter Regulatory Obligation, Meters, and
89 Meter Reading distribution functional categories in the meter service charge

rather than the customer charge, as proposed by CILCO. I also recommend changes to CILCO's proposed use of combined DST rate classifications to develop customer, usage, and access charges. In addition, I recommend revisions to Rider MS related to depicting typical meter service charges for DST rate classifications. Possible additional recommendations will be addressed in my rebuttal testimony, pending CILCO's responses to the second set of data requests from the Illinois Industrial Energy Consumers (IIEC).

III. DELINEATION OF TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES

- Q. Why is it necessary to evaluate CILCO's proposed functionalization between transmission and distribution for common and general plant accounts, as presented in the direct testimonies of CILCO witnesses Getz (CILCO Exhibit 2.0) and Bilsland (CILCO Exhibit 3.0) in Docket No. 01-0465?
- A. The delineation of transmission and distribution facilities serves as a prelude to the review of CILCO's residential DST filing. The delineation of such facilities provides the basis for CILCO's electric distribution rate base and revenue requirement in this DST proceeding. Since CILCO elected to functionalize common and general plant accounts in Docket No. 01-0465, it is important to determine the accuracy of CILCO's functionalization in relation to this residential DST proceeding.

112 Q. Do the findings from Docket No. 01-0465 preclude subsequent revisions to
113 CILCO's proposed functionalization and allocation for DST in Docket No. 01-
114 0637?

115 A. No. Staff has conducted the usual review of CILCO's delivery services cost of
116 service study, rate design proposals, and tariffs. Staff's recommendations for
117 revisions in Docket No. 01-0637 supplement the findings in the transmission-
118 distribution delineation proceeding.

119

120 Q. How did you evaluate CILCO's proposed delineation between transmission and
121 distribution facilities?

122 A. My evaluation focused on the proposed functional allocation of common and
123 general electric plant accounts, as depicted in CILCO Exhibit 2.1, Exhibit C
124 (Docket No. 01-0465). I evaluated the cost basis and reasonableness of the
125 allocations between gas and electric functions as well as between electric
126 distribution and transmission for the common and general plant accounts. Based
127 on these analyses, I reached conclusions regarding the appropriateness of the
128 allocations and recommended certain changes.

129

130

131 Q. Please discuss the results of your analysis of CILCO's proposed functionalization
132 of common and general plant to electric distribution.

133 A. My review of CILCO WP C-1 (Common Plant in Service) revealed that CILCO
134 account No. 9170000, titled "Downtn Off Liberty St" (line 25) was allocated on a
135 different basis than the other CILCO service centers. Instead of allocating 50%

of the Liberty Street office to gas and 50% to electric, as in the case of the other service centers, CILCO used “net plant” as the allocator for No. 9170000 accounts associated with the Peoria office facility. In my opinion, the Liberty Street office should be allocated on the same basis as the other service centers.

Q. What was the basis of CILCO’s “50/50” allocator?

A. CILCO based the 50/50 allocator on the overall percentage of gas and electric customers. According to CILCO’s Year-2000 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Form 1 information (page 300), CILCO has 199,876 electric customers and 205,375 gas customers. The corresponding percentages of total customers are 49.32% for electric and 50.68% for gas. Based on this information, CILCO rounded each percentage to 50% for use in allocating costs.

Q. Do you agree that the 50/50 allocator should be used to split plant costs associated with CILCO’s service centers?

A. Yes. Even though an argument could be made that a 49% electric and 51% split would be more technically accurate, it is also likely that the number of gas and electric customers changes over time, resulting in continuing increases and decreases in the percentages.

156 Q. How did using the 50/50 allocator change the allocation of the Liberty Street
157 office?

158 A. Using the 50/50 allocator moved approximately \$1,494,500 from electric
159 distribution to gas. At Staff's request, CILCO prepared and provided to Staff
160 CILCO WP C-2, which illustrates not only the use of the 50/50 allocator for the
161 Liberty Street Office 9170000 accounts, but also depicts the various common
162 plant categories by FERC account number. CILCO WP C-2 is attached to my
163 testimony as Schedule 1.

164

165 Q. Did you compare CILCO's proposed allocation of common and general plant for
166 the 2000 test year to the 1997 test year as used by CILCO in Docket Nos. 99-
167 0119/99-0131, consolidated (CILCO's non-residential DST proceeding)?

168 A. Yes. I requested and received from CILCO a breakdown by FERC account of
169 common and general plant amounts for test years 1997 and 2000 (shown in
170 Schedule 2). That information showed that CILCO's 2000 test year common and
171 general plant electric proposed distribution total of \$52,470,777¹ is \$16,533,645
172 more than the 1997 test year proposed total of \$37,937,132. The majority of the
173 increase (86%) is derived from common plant accounts. Specifically, FERC
174 accounts 303 and 391 accounted for most of the common plant increase. These
175 two accounts include computer software/hardware and related office costs,
176 which, as discussed in CILCO Exhibit 3.0, p. 6, lines 115-121 (Docket No. 01-
177 0465), are associated with the implementation of CILCO's Customer/1 CIS

computer system. Even with the increases, CILCO's proposed percentage of total general and common plant amounts allocated to electric distribution was approximately equal (55% in 1997 and 56% in 2000).

Q. Does the comparison shown in Schedule 2 accurately depict the results of Docket Nos. 99-0119/99-0131, consolidated?

A. No. The amount of general plant actually approved for distribution in CILCO's non-residential docket was reduced from CILCO's proposal. The general plant distribution amount approved in the non-residential DST docket totaled \$9,823,000, compared to \$19,652,950 proposed by CILCO.

Q. What methodology was approved in Docket Nos. 99-0119/99-0131, consolidated for allocating general plant costs to distribution?

A. The approved distribution amount for general plant was based on a labor allocator that included electric generation, transmission, and distribution. The distribution amount represented approximately 41% of the total.²

Q. Does CILCO's proposed general plant allocation to distribution in this residential DST proceeding conform to the method approved in Docket Nos. 99-0119/99-0131, consolidated?

A. No. In this proceeding, CILCO proposes to use a labor allocator that does not include electric generation.

¹ The 2000 total includes the recommended reduction associated with the Peoria Office facility noted earlier in this testimony.

200

201 Q. What is your recommendation regarding CILCO's proposed allocation of general
202 plant in this residential DST proceeding?

203 A. In my opinion, a labor allocator should be used that reflects electric generation,
204 transmission, and distribution, which is the same methodology approved in
205 Docket Nos. 99-0119/99-0131, consolidated. For purposes of implementing this
206 recommendation, CILCO allocator AF1 should be used instead of CILCO
207 allocator AF2 (CILCO WPC-1d, p. 1 of 6) to allocate general plant costs to
208 distribution. The percent allocated to distribution under allocator AF1 is 46%,
209 compared to 86% under allocator AF2, which excludes electric generation.

210

211 Q. What is the result of using allocator AF1 instead of allocator AF2 to assign
212 general plant costs?

213 A. The result is that \$11,836,120 of CILCO's general plant costs would be allocated
214 to distribution instead of \$21,965,165 as proposed by CILCO.

215

216 Q. Please summarize your recommendations in regard to CILCO's delineation of
217 transmission and distribution facilities.

218 A. Based on my analysis of CILCO's filing in Docket No. 01-0465, I recommend that
219 CILCO No. 9170000 common plant accounts, which comprise the Liberty Street
220 office facility, be allocated to gas and electric on the same basis as other CILCO
221 service centers. The result is that the \$32,000,121 figure for Electric Distribution,

² This same labor allocator was used to allocate administrative and general expenses, as discussed later in my testimony.

shown on line 42 in CILCO WP C-1, Common Plant in Service, should be changed to \$30,505,612 as shown on line 48 in my Schedule 1 (CILCO WP C-2). In supplemental direct testimony (CILCO Exhibit No. 2.2, Docket No. 01-0465), CILCO agreed to using the 50/50 allocator for CILCO No. 9170000 accounts.³ I also recommend using CILCO allocator AF1 instead of allocator AF2 to allocate general plant costs to distribution. Revisions to CILCO's cost study, necessary to accomplish this recommendation, will be addressed in my rebuttal testimony due to the late receipt of clarifying information contained in CILCO's responses to Illinois Industrial Energy Consumers (IIEC) second set of data requests.

IV. OVERVIEW OF CILCO'S DST COST STUDY METHODOLOGY

- Q. What are the primary bases of CILCO's proposed DST rates?
- A. CILCO uses a 2000 test year and an embedded cost study. As noted above, CILCO allocates delivery services costs from FERC accounts to several distribution functional categories as well as to the current DST customer rate classifications. Based on these allocations, revenue requirement totals are developed for the various DST customer classes. In this manner, a revenue requirement for each DST customer class is linked to one or more of the distribution functional categories.

³ In Docket No. 01-0637, this revised amount appears in CILCO Exhibit 10.0, WPB-1e.

CILCO's cost study methodology relies heavily on allocating costs to rate classes on the basis of voltage, determined from class non-coincident peaks (NCP) at various points along the distribution system. By allocating costs in this manner, CILCO seeks to implement DST charges that are based more on individual usage characteristics. For example, larger customers under Rate N5 (subtransmission DST rate classification) are not allocated costs associated with distribution transformers since these customers typically provide their own transformation. Thus, CILCO's proposed DST rates are the result of allocating costs and resulting revenue requirements on the basis of voltage characteristics, NCP allocators, and distribution functional categories.

Q. Is CILCO's proposed cost of service study methodology the same as approved in Docket Nos. 99-0119/99-0131, consolidated?

A. Overall the methodologies are similar. However, some significant differences do exist. These differences impact the final rate design and DST rate levels.

Q. Do you agree with CILCO's general cost study methodology?

A. Yes. I agree with CILCO's general approach. However, while some of the differences mentioned above are appropriate, others should not be accepted. Both types of differences are discussed in my testimony. Based on the reasons discussed in my testimony, I believe modifications to CILCO's cost study and proposed rate design are needed to arrive at appropriate DST rates.

266 Q. Is CILCO proposing significant changes to its existing DST rate classifications?

267 A. Yes. In addition to developing residential DST rates, CILCO is proposing all new
268 non-residential DST rate classifications. CILCO proposes to replace current
269 Rates 35-37 and Riders DST 1-3 with Rate RDS, Rate NDS, Rider MS, and other
270 related riders. A comparison between the current DST rate classifications and
271 proposed Rates RDS and NDS (as proposed in errata materials filed on
272 November 9, 2001) is shown below:

273	<u>Current</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
274	Rates 1, 15	R1 (energy rate)
275	Rate 2	R2 (demand rate < 1000 kw)
276		
277	Rates 22, 13-secondary	
278	<5kw	N1 (energy rate)
279		
280	Rates 21-secondary,	
281	13-secondary >5kw	N2 (demand rate < 1000kw)
282		
283	Rates 21-secondary,	
284	13-secondary >5kw	N3 (demand rate > 1000kw)
285		
286	Rates 21-primary, 13-	
287	primary	N4 (primary demand rate)
288		
289	Rates 21-subtransmission, 32-	
290	subtransmission, 13-	
291	subtransmission	N5 (subtransmission demand rate)
292		

293 Q. Is CILCO proposing significant changes to existing DST rate levels?

294 A. Yes, significant changes are proposed for some DST rate classifications. For
295 example, based on CILCO's November 9th errata materials, CILCO proposes to
296 increase selected rate levels as follows:

297	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Proposed Increase</u>
298	13-secondary >5kw capacity charge	\$4.71/kw to \$6.62/kw (41%)

299 customer charge \$3.21/mon to \$7.88/mon (146%)

300 21-secondary capacity charge \$4.58/kw to \$5.49/kw (20%)

301 21-primary capacity charge \$4.03/kw to \$4.23/kw (5%)

302

303 **V. FUNCTIONAL ALLOCATION**

304

305 Q. What is the total revenue requirement proposed by CILCO, based on distribution
306 delivery services totals by FERC account?

307 A. CILCO's cost study proposes a delivery services revenue requirement of
308 approximately \$112,057,000 (as explained in CILCO's response to Staff data
309 request DLS-11; Attachment 1 to my testimony). This proposed revenue
310 requirement compares to \$89,700,000 approved in Order No. 99-0119/99-0131,
311 consolidated.

312

313 Q. Please describe CILCO's functional allocation study.

314 A. CILCO's functional allocation study assigns delivery services cost totals from
315 each FERC account simultaneously to several functional categories related to
316 distribution and to DST rate classes.

317

318 Q. Please discuss how CILCO's cost study allocates the electric distribution delivery
319 services cost totals by FERC account across distribution functional categories
320 and DST rate classes.

321 A. For each FERC account, CILCO's cost study allocates costs among
322 subcategories of three general distribution-related functional categories
323 designated as capacity, meter, and customer, as follows:

324	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Meter</u>	<u>Customer</u>
325	Subtransmission	second-single ph	meter reading
326	subtransmission-subst	secondary	customer records
327	direct assignment-subst	primary	uncollectables
328	primary substations	primary-substation	customer assistance
329	primary	subtransmission	customer information
330	secondary	transmission	customer black start
331	load dispatching		meter regulatory obligation
332	additional facilities		instrument transformer
333	distribution transformers		customer services
334			lighting
335			customer advances
336			deposits
337			late payment
338			

339 CILCO uses direct assignment and internally developed allocators to assign
340 costs to the distribution functional categories.

341

342 Q. Have sales expenses been properly excluded from distribution?

343 A. Yes. In CILCO's cost of service study, no distribution sales expense is included
344 in FERC accounts 911-916.

345

Q. In regard to CILCO's proposed allocation of delivery services costs to distribution functional categories in this Docket and the methodology approved in Docket Nos. 99-0119/99-0131, consolidated, are there differences that impact the final DST rates?

A. Yes. Based on my review of these differences, I identified six that have a significant impact on final DST rates.

Q. Please discuss these significant differences and their associated impact on final DST rates.

A. The first significant difference that I reviewed related to FERC accounts 360-362. These accounts show substantial increases in subtransmission costs due to the results of Docket No. 01-0465. I believe that this difference is appropriate based on the costs that were reassigned from primary to subtransmission in that Docket.

The second significant difference relates to costs in FERC account 368. Costs in this account are now split between the primary and secondary distribution functional categories. In the previous non-residential DST proceeding, the costs were split between line transformers and direct assignment. In my view, the proposed split is an acceptable change that helps to better define FERC account 368 costs on the basis of voltage.

The third significant change that I reviewed relates to FERC account 369, Services. Costs in this account were allocated to demand distribution services in 1999, which ultimately were recovered in DST usage charges. In the current proceeding, CILCO proposes to allocate FERC account 369 costs to customer services and recover the associated revenue requirement in DST access charges. This proposed change results in increased customer charges, in the form of a proposed service access charge for all DST rate classifications except Rates N4 and N5. Based on the study provided by CILCO that depicts how FERC account 369 costs are allocated, I believe that it is appropriate to recover customer services costs through customer charges rather than usage charges.

A fourth significant difference is related to FERC account 370. In 1999, these costs were allocated entirely to meters. Now, in addition to meters, CILCO has assigned FERC account 370 costs to new subcategories of “customer meter regulatory obligation” (cmro) and “instrument transformer”. CILCO defines cmro as “... the costs related to the investments remaining on the records of the Company, for customers where their meter has been removed, as it relates to providing meter services.” (CILCO response to Staff data request DLS-13; Attachment 2 to my testimony) I interpret CILCO’s definition to mean that the Company intends to use the FERC account 370 subcategory of cmro to recover costs related to equipment that will no longer be used. CILCO further states, “When the Company removes its meter from a customer’s premises, the capitalized costs for installation remains on the Company’s books until the meter

391 is retired.” (CILCO response to Staff data request DLS-14; Attachment 3 to my
392 testimony) Presumably, CILCO is choosing to keep this unused equipment
393 under the pretext that the equipment might be needed in the future if a customer
394 returns to CILCO from DST rates. The issue of whether such costs should be
395 recovered must be decided outside this proceeding in light of the fact that
396 CILCO’s FERC Form 1 information related to FERC account 370 is fixed.
397 However, for purposes of establishing DST rates and charges, I do not agree that
398 such costs should be recovered from all customers through the DST customer
399 charge, as proposed by CILCO. In essence, CILCO’s use of the cmro
400 distribution functional category increases customer charges and lowers meter
401 service charges. Instead, I believe that cmro costs should be allocated either to
402 meters in general or to other meter-related distribution functional categories.
403 However, in lieu of making such an adjustment at the functionalization stage of
404 the cost study, I recommend revisions to CILCO’s rate design proposals, as
405 discussed in the rate design section of my testimony (in relation to my first
406 recommended rate design revision).

407
408 The fifth significant difference relates to FERC accounts 580-598. Costs in these
409 accounts were allocated to demand distribution services in 1999, and ultimately
410 were recovered in DST usage charges. Now, CILCO proposes to allocate FERC
411 accounts 580, 586-590, and 597-598 to a combination of meters, cmro, and
412 customer services distribution functional categories. The ultimate result is
413 increased customer and access charges and lower usage charges. I do not

414 believe that such costs should be recovered in customer charges. However, In
415 lieu of making an adjustment at the functionalization stage of the cost study, I
416 recommend revisions to CILCO's rate design proposals, as discussed in the rate
417 design section of my testimony (as part of my first recommended rate design
418 revision).

419
420 The sixth significant difference relates to FERC accounts 920-935 (administrative
421 and general or A & G accounts). For the same reasons mentioned previously in
422 regard to allocating general plant costs to distribution, I do not believe that costs
423 in the A & G accounts are properly allocated to DST rate classifications, because
424 CILCO used allocator AF2 to determine the distribution amounts for these
425 accounts. The AF2 allocator does not include electric generation and therefore
426 does not conform to the methodology approved in CILCO's 1999 DST docket for
427 allocating A & G accounts to distribution. In that docket, A & G accounts were
428 allocated to distribution on the basis of a labor allocator that included electric
429 generation, transmission and distribution. Therefore, I recommend using CILCO
430 allocator AF1 to allocate A & G FERC accounts to distribution, prior to allocating
431 costs to DST rate classifications. Allocator AF1 includes electric generation,
432 transmission, and distribution. However, due to the late receipt of clarifying
433 information contained in CILCO's responses to IIEC's second set of data
434 requests, revisions to CILCO's cost study reflecting the use of allocator AF1 will
435 be addressed in my rebuttal testimony.

Q. Please summarize your conclusions and recommendations regarding revisions to CILCO's functional allocation of electric distribution delivery services totals by FERC account.

A. My conclusions and recommendations related to CILCO's proposed functional allocation are as follows:

1. FERC accounts 360-362 and 368 are appropriately allocated.
2. The allocation of FERC account 369 is appropriate.
3. The allocations of FERC accounts 370, 580, 586-590, and 597-598 are not appropriate and are addressed in my recommended rate design revisions.
4. The allocations for FERC accounts 920-935 are not appropriate, and will be addressed in rebuttal testimony, pending further review of CILCO's responses to IIEC's second set of data responses.

VII. RATE DESIGN

A. Description

Q. Please describe CILCO's methodology for developing revenue requirements for DST customer classes.

A. Based on the costs assigned to distribution functional categories and to existing DST rate classifications, a revenue requirement is developed for each current DST rate classification. Subsequently, final revenue requirements are created for each proposed DST rate classification. In addition, CILCO unbundles residential metering, as recommended by Staff in all the current DST dockets.

461

462 Q. Did CILCO submit a different rate design proposal subsequent to its October 3,
463 2001 filing?

464 A. Yes. CILCO submitted errata materials on November 9, 2001, that altered the
465 original DST rate classifications and significantly changed rate design proposals
466 filed on October 3, 2001.

467

468 Q. Please describe CILCO's proposed new DST rate classifications, as submitted
469 on November 9th, that are based on combinations of existing DST rate
470 classifications.

471 A. In my view, the proposed combinations accurately reflect common
472 characteristics, based primarily on voltage similarities. For example, while
473 proposed DST Rate R1 is comprised of current DST Rates 1 and 15, and
474 proposed DST Rate N1 consists of a combination of current Rates 13-secondary
475 < 5kw and 22, CILCO adds revenue requirements for all four current DST rates
476 to calculate the same customer, energy and access charges for proposed DST
477 Rates R1 and N1. A similar combination process is used to develop charges for
478 proposed DST Rates R2, N2, and N3.

479

480 Q. Please describe CILCO's overall rate design.

481 A. DST charges proposed by CILCO include Customer Charges, Distribution
482 Capacity Reservation (demand and energy) Charges, Service Access Charges,

Facilities Charges (Rates N4 and N5 customers only), and Meter Service charges.

Q. Please describe the rate design components of each of these charges.

A. As originally proposed by CILCO, the rate design components of each of the proposed DST charges are as follows:

Customer Charge: customer records and collection
uncollectable accounts
customer assistance
information and instruction
customer black start
customer meter regulatory obligation

Capacity Charge: Demand Distribution Components:
subtransmission
subtransmission substation
primary substation
distribution primary
distribution secondary
load dispatching
distribution transformers

Service Access Charge: customer services

Facilities Charge: distribution transformers (Rate N4)
direct assignment substations (Rate N5)

Meter Service Charge: meters
meter reading
cust. meters instrument transformers

CILCO's November 9th filing divides the rate design components of cmro, meters, and meter reading between customer and meter service charges instead of assigning the entire revenue requirement for a component to either the customer charge or the meter service charge.

518

519 Q. Have "Other Revenues" been excluded prior to calculating customer and usage
520 charges?

521 A. Yes. Based on CILCO WPC-11, operating revenues of \$109,190,900 are
522 calculated. Other revenues of \$855,000 are deducted from this amount prior to
523 establishing operating revenues of \$108,335,000 based on CILCO's current rate
524 of return of 9.09%. The operating revenues, excluding other revenues, are then
525 increased to reflect CILCO's requested rate of return in this proceeding of 9.84%.
526 This results in a requested revenue requirement of \$112, 057,000, from which
527 wholesale related revenues of \$129,200 are deducted prior to calculating
528 CILCO's final retail DST rates.

529

530 **B. Recommendations**

531 Q. Are you recommending revisions to CILCO's proposed DST rate design?

532 A. Yes. I am recommending four revisions to CILCO's proposed rate design, as
533 submitted on November 9th.

534

535 Q. What is your first recommended revision to CILCO's proposed DST rate design?

536 A. As discussed previously, I disagree with CILCO's proposal to assign recovery of
537 a portion of revenue requirements for the meters and cmro distribution functional
538 categories (derived from FERC account 370) to customer charges. Instead, I
539 recommend that the cmro-related revenue requirements be recovered through
540 meter service charges, as approved in CILCO's 1999 DST docket and further

541 articulated in Commission Order No. 99-0013 (meter unbundling). As shown in
542 Schedule 3 to my testimony, this recommendation can be accomplished by
543 calculating customer charges excluding meters and cmro. Schedule 4 shows the
544 result of calculating meter service rates after adding the revenue requirements
545 associated with meters and cmro.⁴ The impact of this recommendation is lower
546 customer charges and increased meter service charges, which translates into
547 more savings for customers that choose an alternative meter service provider
548 (MSP).

549
550 This recommendation also addresses my disagreement with CILCO's proposed
551 allocation of FERC accounts 580, 586-590, and 597-598, discussed earlier under
552 Functionalization. My recommendation to recover costs associated with crmo
553 from meter service charges serves to switch cost recovery for these accounts
554 from customer charges to meter service charges.

555
556 Q. What is your second recommended revision to CILCO's proposed DST rate
557 design?

558 A. CILCO proposes to recover a portion of revenue requirements related to meter
559 reading through customer charges, although in the October 3rd filing, CILCO
560 proposed recovery entirely through meter service charges. As in the case of
561 cmro, I recommend that these revenue requirements be recovered through meter

⁴ Both Schedules 3 and 4 are revised worksheets based on original materials provided by CILCO.

562 service charges, as shown in Schedules 3 and 4. This recommendation is also
563 in line with Commission Order No. 99-0013.

564
565 Q. What is your third recommended revision to CILCO's proposed DST rate design?

566 A. CILCO proposes the following combinations of rates and charges:

567 *Same customer, access and energy charges for Rates R1 and N1

568 *Same customer charge for Rates R2, N2, and N3

569 *Same access and demand charges for Rates R2 and N2

570 I recommend individual customer, access and usage charges for Rates R1, R2,
571 N1, N2, and N3. My recommended adjustments are shown in Schedule 3. As
572 shown in Schedule 3, I calculated individual charges for each DST rate
573 classification, including my recommendations related to customer and meter
574 service charges discussed above.

575
576 Q. What is your fourth recommended revision to CILCO's proposed DST rate
577 design?

578 A. I recommend adding text to Rider MS to clarify how the various meter
579 configurations in Rider MS apply to DST rate classifications. Such language
580 would explain the typical metering configuration that applies to a particular DST
581 rate classification. Additional text should also be provided to indicate that
582 customers that do not use the typical meter configuration must pay the
583 appropriate meter service charges, according to metering type. Schedule 5

shows my recommended additional text. My recommended language would replace CILCO's proposed text, submitted on November 9th.

Q. Have you identified other issues related to CILCO's proposed DST rate design?

A. Yes. Meter service charges are listed in Rider MS using two columns. The first column lists meter charges for customers choosing CILCO as the MSP. The second column lists charges for customers choosing an alternative MSP. Both columns indicate charges associated with specific types of metering configurations. There is potential confusion regarding what the two columns represent in terms of why a customer would continue to pay meter service charges to CILCO, even if the customer chooses an alternative MSP. In fact, CILCO appears to be the only Illinois electric utility to depict meter service charges in this manner.

As a first step in addressing this issue, definitions of the two columns must be noted. The first column represents the costs that CILCO incurs for serving as an MSP. The second column represents the instrument transformer costs that CILCO believes must be paid by customers using an alternative MSP, but still requiring instrument transformer metering. Customers that do not require instrument transformer metering would not pay charges in the second column if an alternative MSP is selected. The question arises as to whether two columns of meter service charges are necessary. Although potentially confusing, I do not recommend eliminating the second (MSP) column at this time. If the second

column was eliminated, instrument transformer metering costs incurred by CILCO would need to be recovered in another manner, such as through the customer charge. Based on discussions with CILCO staff, it is the Company's position that if the MSP column is eliminated, customer charges would need to be increased and spread over all customers, regardless of their use of instrument transformation.

Q. Please summarize your recommendations related to CILCO's proposed DST rate design.

A. My rate design recommendations can be summarized as follows:

1. Revenue requirements associated with both meters and cmro (derived from FERC account 370) should be recovered through meter service charges.
2. Revenue requirements related to meter reading should be recovered through meter service charges.
3. Individual customer charges should be developed for Rates R1, R2, and N1.
4. Individual access charges and usage charges should be developed for Rates R1, R2, N1, and N2.
5. Additional text should be included in Rider MS to explain how the various meter service charges apply to DST rate classifications. Additional text should also be provided to indicate that customers

that do not use the typical meter configuration must pay the
appropriate meter service charges, according to metering type.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

Q. Please summarize the results of your recommendations.

A. My recommendations for modifications to CILCO's proposals in Docket Nos. 01-0465 and 01-0637 result in the following DST rates and charges, as shown in Schedules 3 and 4. The rates and charges do not include possible adjustments to the Company's revenue requirements from other Staff witnesses. The rates and charges also do not include revisions to CILCO's cost study to reflect my recommendation to use a different allocator for allocating general plant and FERC accounts 920-935 to distribution. Pending further review of CILCO's clarifying responses to IIEC's second set of data requests, received on November 27, 2001, additional Staff adjustments and the appropriate allocator for general plant and FERC accounts 920-935, along with resulting changes in Staff's recommended revenue requirement, will be addressed in my rebuttal testimony.

Delivery Services Rates

	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Staff Recommended</u>				<u>CILCO Proposed</u>			
	(November 9, 2001)								
	<u>Customer</u>	<u>Dist. Cap.</u>	<u>Serv. Acc.</u>	<u>Fac.</u>		<u>Customer</u>	<u>Dist. Cap.</u>	<u>Serv. Acc.</u>	<u>Fac.</u>
	(\$/month)	(\$/kw)	(\$/acc. pt.)	(\$/kw)		(\$/month)	(\$/kw)	(\$/acc.pt.)	(\$/kw)
N5	\$693.63	\$0.54	\$NA	\$0.59		\$825.10	\$0.54	\$NA	\$0.59
N4	10.87	4.23	NA	0.52		14.50	4.23	NA	0.52
N3	5.41	5.49	106.94	NA		7.88	5.49	106.94	NA

657	N2	5.41	6.67	2.32	NA	7.88	6.62	2.30	NA
658	N1	4.82	0.0292/kwh	2.31	NA	5.67	0.0222/kwh	2.66	NA
659	R2	5.07	4.30	1.86	NA	7.88	6.62	2.30	NA
660	R1	4.23	0.0219/kwh	2.68	NA	5.67	0.0222/kwh	2.66	NA

661 **Monthly Meter Service Charges**

		<u>Staff Recommended</u>		<u>CILCO Proposed</u>	
		<u>CILCO</u>	<u>MSP</u>	<u>CILCO</u>	<u>MSP</u>
Non-Transformer-Rated Metering					
667	Kwh Meter-Single Phase	\$2.65	\$0.00	\$ 1.43	\$ 0.00
668	Kwh Meter-Three Phase	9.61	0.00	5.11	0.00
669	Kw Meter-Single/Three Ph	7.61	0.00	4.05	0.00
Transformer-Rated Metering – Non-Interval					
673	Kw TOU Meter-S/T Ph	\$17.21	\$7.84	\$ 12.83	\$ 7.84
674	Kw Meter-Three Phase	17.90	8.43	13.47	8.43
675	Kw Meter-Three Ph 480v	24.97	15.35	20.47	15.35
676	Kw Meter-Primary	125.75	116.13	121.25	116.13

678 **Transformer-Rated Metering - Interval**

680	Meter-Secondary	\$118.51	\$14.52	\$ 70.58	\$ 14.52
681	Meter 5kv – Primary	202.86	100.86	172.80	100.86
682	Meter 15kv – Primary	249.97	153.64	219.91	153.64
683	Meter 34.5kv or 69kv				
684	Subtransmission	636.63	534.61	606.57	534.61
685	Meter 138kv –				
686	Transmission	1435.28	1331.35	1435.28	1331.35

688 Q. If the Commission approves a DST revenue requirement that is different from the
689 one used in your analyses, how should the DST rates as shown in your
690 Schedules 3 and 4 be modified?

691 A. The DST rates recommended in my Schedules 3 and 4 should be adjusted
692 across the board based on the percentage difference between the revenue

693 requirement used in my analyses and the revenue requirement approved by the
694 Commission.

695

696 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

697 A. Yes.

**Central Illinois Light Company
Common Plant in Service
December 31, 2000**

CILCO WP C-2
Docket no. 01-0465
Witness: M J Getz

Docket Nos. 01-0465/01-0530/01-0637 (Consol)
ICC Staff Exhibit 6.0
Schedule 1

Line # ICC Acct

	7528800	8124593	9110000	9170000	9190000	9200000	9210000	9240000	9550000	9850000	9890000	9910000	9920000	9980000	Grand Total
pllt 5	Atlanta	Philo	Mainframe - Communication Equi	Downtn Off Liberty St	Information Systems Center-Bar	Harrison Street Area	Liberty Street Parking Lot	310 Liberty St.	Morton Serv Bldg	Eastern Service Center	Springfield Service Center	Lincoln Service Center	Homer-Service Center	Tuscola Office Buildings	General Plant** Non Location *
1 303	34700														
2 389	34701														
3 390	34702	\$6,588.91	\$5,539.49		\$325,110.00	\$40,720.23	\$48,418.58	\$41,217.00	\$55,661.59	\$127,631.49	\$30,721.94	\$30,204.24	\$54,541.90		\$29,308,242.47
4 391	34703			\$2,213.74	\$5,404,704.34	\$748,935.46	\$475,429.56	\$180,287.35	\$49,760.04	\$4,879.73	\$1,758,485.76	\$1,351,306.46	\$993,634.89	\$127,180.16	\$8,996.78
5 393	34705				\$222,033.78										\$12,472,867.92
6 394	34706														\$50,168.40
7 397	34709														\$763,449.59
8 398	34710														\$917,868.75
9	Grand Total	\$6,588.91	\$5,539.49	\$2,213.74	\$5,951,848.12	\$789,655.69	\$523,848.14	\$221,504.35	\$105,421.63	\$4,879.73	\$1,886,117.25	\$1,382,028.40	\$1,023,839.13	\$181,722.06	\$8,996.78
10															\$43,517,530.11
11															\$55,611,733.53

	Cilco Acct	Location	Description	Gross Plant	Codes	Generation	Gas	El Distr 93%	El Trans 7%	Grand Total
13 303	34700	9980000	Gen Pllt Excluding CIS System	\$15,569,692.35	B		\$7,784,846.18	\$7,239,906.94	\$544,939.23	\$15,569,692.35
14 Intangible		9980000	Customer/1 CIS System	\$13,738,550.12	D		\$6,869,275.06	\$6,869,275.06	\$0.00	\$13,738,550.12
15			Unclassified Plant	\$3,430,912.81	See WP A-9	\$330,912.81	\$558,000.00	\$355,880.00	\$2,186,120.00	\$3,430,912.81
16 389	34701	9170000	Downtn Off Liberty St	\$325,110.00	B		\$162,555.00	\$151,176.15	\$11,378.85	\$325,110.00
17 Land		9190000	Information Systems Center	\$40,720.23	B		\$20,360.12	\$18,934.91	\$1,425.20	\$40,720.23
18		9200000	Harrison Street Area	\$48,418.58	B		\$24,209.29	\$22,514.64	\$1,694.65	\$48,418.58
19		9210000	Liberty Street Parking Lot	\$41,217.00	B		\$20,608.50	\$19,165.91	\$1,442.59	\$41,217.00
20		9240000	310 Liberty St.	\$55,661.59	B		\$27,830.80	\$25,882.64	\$1,948.15	\$55,661.59
21		9700000	Eastern Service Center	\$127,631.49	C			\$118,697.29	\$8,934.20	\$127,631.49
22		9850000	Springfield Service Center	\$30,721.94	B		\$15,360.97	\$14,285.70	\$1,075.27	\$30,721.94
23		9890000	Lincoln Service Center	\$30,204.24	B		\$15,102.12	\$14,044.97	\$1,057.15	\$30,204.24
24		9910000	Homer-Service Center	\$54,541.90	B		\$27,270.95	\$25,361.98	\$1,908.97	\$54,541.90
25 390	34702	7528800	Atlanta	\$6,588.91	A					\$6,588.91
26 Structures		8124593	Philo	\$5,539.49	A			\$5,539.49		\$5,539.49
27		9170000	Downtn Off Liberty St	\$5,404,704.34	B		\$2,702,352.17	\$2,513,187.52	\$189,164.65	\$5,404,704.34
28		9190000	Information Systems Center	\$748,935.46	B		\$374,467.73	\$348,254.99	\$26,212.74	\$748,935.46
29		9200000	Harrison Street Area	\$475,429.56	B		\$237,714.78	\$221,074.75	\$16,640.03	\$475,429.56
30		9210000	Liberty Street Parking Lot	\$180,287.35	B		\$90,143.68	\$83,833.62	\$6,310.05	\$180,287.35
31		9240000	310 Liberty St.	\$49,760.04	B		\$24,880.02	\$23,138.42	\$1,741.60	\$49,760.04
32		9550000	Morton Serv Bldg	\$4,879.73	E			\$4,879.73		\$4,879.73
33		9700000	Eastern Service Center	\$1,758,485.76	C			\$1,635,391.76	\$123,094.00	\$1,758,485.76
34		9850000	Springfield Service Center	\$1,351,306.46	B		\$675,653.23	\$628,357.50	\$47,295.73	\$1,351,306.46
35		9890000	Lincoln Service Center	\$993,634.89	B		\$496,817.45	\$462,040.22	\$34,777.22	\$993,634.89
36		9910000	Homer-Service Center	\$127,180.16	B		\$63,590.08	\$59,138.77	\$4,451.31	\$127,180.16
37		9920000	Tuscola Office Buildings	\$8,996.78	B		\$4,498.39	\$4,183.50	\$314.89	\$8,996.78
38			Unclassified Plant	\$557,106.32	See WP A-9		\$278,553.16	\$259,054.44	\$19,498.72	\$557,106.32
39 391	34703	9110000	Mainframe-Communication Eq	\$2,213.74	B		\$1,106.87	\$1,029.39	\$77.48	\$2,213.74
40 Office Eq		9170000	Downtn Off Liberty St	\$222,033.78	B		\$111,016.89	\$103,245.71	\$7,771.18	\$222,033.78
41		9980000	General Plant** Non Location *	\$12,472,867.92	B		\$6,236,433.96	\$5,799,883.58	\$436,550.38	\$12,472,867.92
42			Unclassified Plant	\$8,026,106.21	See WP A-9	\$866,753.73	\$2,828,671.82	\$2,655,509.12	\$1,675,171.54	\$8,026,106.21
43 393 Stores	34705	9980000	General Plant** Non Location *	\$50,168.40	B		\$25,084.20	\$23,328.31	\$1,755.89	\$50,168.40
44 394	34706	9980000	General Plant** Non Location *	\$763,449.59	B		\$381,724.80	\$355,004.06	\$26,720.73	\$763,449.59
45 Tools, Garage			Unclassified Plant	\$18,750.82	See WP A-9		\$9,375.41	\$8,719.13	\$656.28	\$18,750.82
46 397 Com Eq	34709	9980000	General Plant** Non Location *	\$917,868.75	B		\$458,934.38	\$426,808.97	\$32,125.40	\$917,868.75
47 398 Misc Eq	34710	9980000	General Plant** Non Location *	\$4,932.98	B		\$2,466.49	\$2,293.84	\$172.65	\$4,932.98
48				\$67,644,609.69			\$1,197,666.54	\$30,528,904.50	\$30,505,611.92	\$5,412,426.73
49										\$67,644,609.69

A	34.5 Distribution
B	Common Plant allocated 50-50 between electric and gas based on customers. Electric portion split based on net plant % for Distribution & Transmission based on plant
C	Eastern Service Center (all electric) - Allocated between distribution and transmission based on net plant
D	Corporate Systems Software -- \$6,869,275.06 for electric half of Customer/1 Customer Information System does not get allocated to transmission
E	Old Morton Service Center next to distribution Central Substation, used for storage.

Notes: The Company has reorganized into separate business units at separate facilities. The production group has taken responsibility for corporate functions that were previously performed at the General Office (9170000) and they have installed their own general ledgers, payroll, accounts payable, and inventory systems at the power plants.

Intangible plant represents corporate software used by Electric and gas T&D units for inventory, accounts payable, general ledger, and budgeting which are split 50-50 between electric and gas based on customers. The electric portion is split based on net plant % for T&D. Billing system electric portion all distribution, see code D above.

Docket Nos. 01-0465/01-0530/01-0637 (Consol)

CENTRAL ILLINOIS LIGHT COMPANY

Electric General and Common Plant Comparison

ICC Staff Exhibit 6.0
Schedule 2

ICC ACCOUNT NUMBER	1997 Amount	2000 Amount	Increase (Decrease)
GENERAL PLANT			
389 Land	104,872.58	95,546.00	(9,326.58)
390 Structures	6,029,062.79	6,039,426.07	10,363.28
391 Office Equip	1,038,106.81	1,479,610.11	441,503.30
392 Transportation Eq	3,420,320.02	3,603,607.98	183,287.96
393 Stores Equip	119,525.62	105,510.62	(14,015.00)
394 Tools,Shop, & Garage Eq	2,348,385.63	2,651,326.86	302,941.23
395 Lab Equip	1,245,926.09	1,126,124.82	(119,801.27)
396 Power Operated Equip	9,449,036.69	10,417,094.46	968,057.77
397 Communication Equip	181,707.26	210,716.96	29,009.70
398 Miscellaneous Equip	1,729.06	1,729.06	0.00
TOTAL GENERAL PLANT	23,938,672.55	25,730,692.94	1,792,020.39
Portion assigned to Distribution	19,652,948.77	21,965,164.72	
% assigned to Distribution	82%	85%	
COMMON PLANT			
303 Miscellaneous Intangible	14,511,723.80	32,739,155.28	18,227,431.48
389 Land	929,599.40	754,226.97	(175,372.43)
390 Structures	15,857,082.16	11,672,835.25	(4,184,246.91)
391 Office Equip	8,801,459.55	20,723,221.65	11,921,762.10
393 Stores Equip	61,747.82	50,168.40	(11,579.42)
394 Tools,Shop, & Garage Eq	565,520.34	782,200.41	216,680.07
397 Communication Equip	921,728.49	917,868.75	(3,859.74)
398 Miscellaneous Equip	4,932.98	4,932.98	0.00
TOTAL COMMON PLANT	41,653,794.54	67,644,609.69	25,990,815.15
Portion assigned to Distribution	16,284,183.40	30,505,611.92	
% assigned to Distribution	39%	45%	
Total Electric General & Common	65,592,467.09	93,375,302.63	
Portion assigned to Distribution	35,937,132.17	52,470,776.64	
% assigned to Distribution	55%	56%	

FINAL

16-Nov-01

KWH RATE - R1 AND N1

LIMITED OFF PEAK SEC RATE 22 DST (14)-3	RESIDENTIAL RATE 1 DST (2)	WATER HEATING RATE 15 DST (5)	GENERAL SERV SECOND RATE 13 DST
--	----------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------

CLAIMED RATE OF RETURN SUMMARY SCHEDULE - COMPONENT FORMAT

RATE OF RETURN	9.84%	9.84%	9.84%	9.84%
----------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

DEVELOPMENT OF RATE

REVENUES REQUIRED

CUSTOMER	ENERGY
----------	--------

1	DEMAND COMPONENTS	\$36,329	\$39,673,801	\$95		
2	DEMAND PRODUCTION	\$0	\$0	\$0		
3	DEMAND TRANSMISSION	\$0	\$0	\$0		
4	DEMAND TRANSMISSION OTHER	\$0	\$0	\$0		
5	DEMAND TRANSM LOAD DISPATCHING	\$0	\$0	\$0		
6	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION	\$36,329	\$39,673,801	\$95	\$1,804,684	
7	DEMAND SUBTRANSMISSION	\$2,163	\$2,952,941	\$9	\$134,883	3,089,995
8	DEMAND SUBTRANSM SUBSTATIONS	\$1,587	\$2,005,411	\$6	\$91,602	2,098,607
9	DEMAND DIRECT ASSIGN SUBSTATIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
10	DEMAND DISTR PRIMARY SUBSTATIONS	\$3,266	\$4,127,131	\$13	\$188,517	4,318,927
11	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION PRIMARY	\$7,989	\$17,783,252	\$32	\$812,295	18,603,568
12	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION SECONDARY	\$0	\$7,891,101	\$18	\$360,446	8,251,565
13	DEMAND DISTRIB LOAD DISPATCHING	\$900	\$449,905	\$4	\$13,032	463,841
14	DEMAND DISTRIB ADD'L FACILITIES REV	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
15	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS	\$20,423	\$4,464,061	\$14	\$203,909	4,688,407
16	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION SERVICES	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
17	ENERGY COMPONENTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
18	CUSTOMER COMPONENTS	\$66,210	\$20,065,405	\$1,248	\$0	
19	370 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - Cust Chrg	\$70	\$611,067	\$251	\$53,703	665,092
	371 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - MS Rider	\$84	\$689,500	\$278	\$60,524	
20	370 - METERS SECONDARY - Cust Chrg	\$4,450	\$66,410	\$0	\$18,235	89,095
	371 - METERS SECONDARY - MS Rider	\$4,996	\$74,935	\$0	\$20,551	
21	370 - METERS PRIMARY - Cust Chrg	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
	371 - METERS PRIMARY - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
22	370 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - Cust Chrg	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
	371 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
23	370 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - Cust Chrg	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
	371 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
24	370 - METERS TRANSMISSION - Cust Chrg	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
	371 - METERS TRANSMISSION - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
25	902 - METER READING - Cust Chrg	\$1,413	\$1,133,120	\$10	\$37,804	1,172,348
	903 - METER READING - MS Rider	\$1,692	\$1,365,054	\$12	\$45,503	
26	903 - CUST RECORDS & COLL	\$6,678	\$6,829,727	\$311	\$227,735	7,064,450
27	904 - UNCOLLECTIBLE ACCOUNTS	\$0	\$215,353	\$0	\$4,466	219,819
28	908 - CUSTOMER ASSISTANCE	\$2,284	\$1,845,459	\$66	\$105,196	1,953,005
29	909 - INFORMATION & INSTRUCT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
30	CUSTOMER BLACK START	\$49	\$24,321	\$0	\$3,076	27,445
31	CUST MTR REG OBLIG - Customer Charge	\$2,528	\$1,119,209	\$157	\$60,540	1,182,433
	CUST MTR REG OBLIG - MS Rider	\$2,838	\$1,262,871	\$175	\$68,230	
32	CUST METERS INSTR TRANSF	\$34,978	\$59,090	\$0	\$0	
33	CUST SERVICES	\$4,501	\$5,645,974	\$0	\$163,071	
34	373 - STR LIGHT & OUTDOOR LIGHT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0
35	CUSTOMER ADVANCES FOR CONSTR	\$0	(\$603,001)	\$0	-\$6,302	(609,303)
36	CUSTOMER DEPOSITS	\$0	(\$4,407)	\$0	-\$91	(4,499)
37	450 - LATE PAYMENT CHARGES	(\$350)	(\$269,277)	-\$12	-\$2,732	(272,371)
38						
39	TOTAL COMPANY	\$102,539	\$59,739,206	\$1,343	\$2,664,192	\$12,373,687
					\$0	\$40,628,737
40	ANNUAL BOOKED KWH SALES	3,543,882	1,769,099,603	14,140	59,260,097	1,831,917,722
41	TOTAL ANNUAL BILLS	2,064	2,108,976	96	70,392	
42	MONTHLY BILLING DEMANDS					
43						
44	CUSTOMER CHARGE and DELIVERY	\$9,010 \$4,366	\$8,914,859 \$4,227	\$377 \$3,928	\$340,472 \$4,837	\$5,672 \$ 0.0222
	R1 Customer Char:	\$4,227	N1 Customer Char	\$4,823		
45	MONTHLY ACCESS CHARGE	Services: \$5,813,546				\$2.66
	R1 Service Charge:	\$2,677				
	N1 Service Charge:	\$2,313				

\$/BILL/MONTH	CENTS/KWH
	Energy Charge:
	R1: \$38,797,200
	\$0.0219
	N1: \$1,831,538
	\$0.0292

Meter Services Rider Revenue Requirements:

371 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - MS Rider	154	1,300,567	529	114,227	1,415,477
371 - METERS SECONDARY - MS Rider	9,446	141,345	0	38,787	189,577
371 - METERS PRIMARY - MS Rider	0	0	0	0	0
371 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - MS Rider	0	0	0	0	0
371 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - MS Rider	0	0	0	0	0
371 - METERS TRANSMISSION - MS Rider	0	0	0	0	0
903 - METER READING - MS Rider	3,105	2,498,174	22	83,307	2,584,609
CUST MTR REG OBLIG - MS Rider	5,366	2,382,080	332	128,769	2,516,547
CUST METERS INSTR TRANSF	34,978	59,090	0	0	94,068
	53,049	6,381,256	883	365,090	6,800,278
	\$53,049	\$6,381,256	\$883	\$365,090	\$6,800,278

Meter Service Revenue Requirements:

Check:
Revenue Requirement by Old Class \$62,507,280
Revenue Requirement by New Class \$65,616,248

R1:	\$6,382,139	N1:	\$418,139
-----	-------------	-----	-----------

FINAL

16-Nov-01

SECONDARY SERVICE DEMAND RATES - R2 AND N2 AND N3

	LARGE RESIDENTIAL RATE 2 DST (3)	INTERMEDIATE SERV SECOND RATE 21 DST (10)	GENERAL SERV SECOND RATE 13 DST FROM RATE CALC GREATER THAN 5KW			
CLAIMED RATE OF RETURN SUMMARY SCHEDULE - COMPONENT FORMAT						
RATE OF RETURN	9.84%	9.84%	9.84%	DEVELOPMENT OF RATE		
REVENUES REQUIRED				CUSTOMER	N2 DEMAND LESS THAN 1000	N3 DEMAND OVER 1000
1 DEMAND COMPONENTS	\$298,345	\$504,050				
2 DEMAND PRODUCTION	\$0	\$0				
3 DEMAND TRANSMISSION	\$0	\$0				
4 DEMAND TRANSMISSION OTHER	\$0	\$0				
5 DEMAND TRANSM LOAD DISPATCHING	\$0	\$0				
6 DEMAND DISTRIBUTION	\$298,345	\$504,050				
7 DEMAND SUBTRANSMISSION	\$22,128	\$46,542	1,493,127		1,493,127	\$46,542
8 DEMAND SUBTRANSM SUBSTATIONS	\$15,028	\$31,608	1,014,018		1,014,018	\$31,608
9 DEMAND DIRECT ASSIGN SUBSTATIONS	\$0	\$0	0		0	\$0
10 DEMAND DISTR PRIMARY SUBSTATIONS	\$30,927	\$65,048	2,086,845		2,086,845	\$65,048
11 DEMAND DISTRIBUTION PRIMARY	\$133,261	\$280,285	8,991,939		8,991,939	\$280,285
12 DEMAND DISTRIBUTION SECONDARY	\$59,133	\$0	3,990,058		3,990,058	\$0
13 DEMAND DISTRIB LOAD DISPATCHING	\$4,416	\$11,018	144,261		144,261	\$11,018
14 DEMAND DISTRIB ADD'L FACILITIES REV	\$0	(\$811)	0		0	(\$811)
15 DEMAND DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS	\$33,452	\$70,359	2,257,228		2,257,228	\$70,359
16 DEMAND DISTRIBUTION SERVICES	\$0	\$0	0		0	\$0
17 ENERGY COMPONENTS	\$0	\$0	0			
18 CUSTOMER COMPONENTS	\$63,343	\$63,404	0			
19 370 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - Cust Chrg	\$4,788	\$0	94,754	99,542		
371 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - MS Rider	\$5,369	\$0	106,788			
20 370 - METERS SECONDARY - Cust Chrg	\$1,344	\$2,643	32,175	36,162		
371 - METERS SECONDARY - MS Rider	\$1,505	\$2,964	36,261			
21 370 - METERS PRIMARY - Cust Chrg	\$0	\$0	0	0		
371 - METERS PRIMARY - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	0			
22 370 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - Cust Chrg	\$0	\$0	0	0		
371 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	0			
23 370 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - Cust Chrg	\$0	\$0	0	0		
371 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	0			
24 370 - METERS TRANSMISSION - Cust Chrg	\$0	\$0	0	0		
371 - METERS TRANSMISSION - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	0			
25 902 - METER READING - Cust Chrg	\$2,443	\$4,828	66,702	73,973		
903 - METER READING - MS Rider	\$2,927	\$5,781	80,285			
26 903 - CUST RECORDS & COLL	\$14,573	\$17,643	401,817	419,460		
27 904 - UNCOLLECTIBLE ACCOUNTS	\$460	\$0	49,434	49,434		
28 908 - CUSTOMER ASSISTANCE	\$7,540	\$11,568	185,608	197,176		
29 909 - INFORMATION & INSTRUCT	\$0	\$0	0	0		
30 CUSTOMER BLACK START	\$239	\$596	5,427	6,023		
31 CUST MTR REG OBLIG - Customer Charge	\$4,218	\$145	106,817	111,180		
CUST MTR REG OBLIG - MS Rider	\$4,734	\$165	120,384			
32 CUST METERS INSTR TRANSF	\$6,723	\$3,203	0			
33 CUST SERVICES	\$8,352	\$14,115	287,723			
34 373 - STR LIGHT & OUTDOOR LIGHT	\$0	\$0	0			
35 CUSTOMER ADVANCES FOR CONSTR	-\$1,287	\$0	-69,764		(69,764)	\$0
36 CUSTOMER DEPOSITS	-\$9	\$0	-1,013		(1,013)	\$0
37 450 - LATE PAYMENT CHARGES	-\$575	(\$247)	-30,244		(30,244)	(\$247)
38						
39 TOTAL COMPANY	\$22,811	\$567,453	21,450,632	\$672,093	\$19,876,456	\$503,803
40 ANNUAL BOOKED KWH SALES	17,366,175	43,368,239	559,843,943			
41 TOTAL ANNUAL BILLS	4,500	132	124,200	124,332		
42 BILLING DEMANDS	68,906	91,794	2,980,438		2,980,438	91,794
375						
43 CUSTOMER CHARGE				\$5.41	\$6.67	\$5.49
(WITHOUT METERING COSTS)				\$5.07	R2 Demand Charge:	\$4.30
		\$296,074	\$14,115		\$/KW-MONTHLY BILLING	
44 MONTHLY ACCESS CHARGE					\$2.30	\$106.94
Access Charge:						
R2: N2: N3:						
\$1.86 \$2.32 \$106.94						
Total						
Meter Services Rider Revenue Requirements:						
371 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - MS Rider	10,157	0	201,543	211,699		
371 - METERS SECONDARY - MS Rider	2,849	5,607	68,435	76,892		
371 - METERS PRIMARY - MS Rider	0	0	0	0		
371 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - MS Rider	0	0	0	0		
371 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - MS Rider	0	0	0	0		
371 - METERS TRANSMISSION - MS Rider	0	0	0	0		
903 - METER READING - MS Rider	5,370	10,609	146,988	162,966		
CUST MTR REG OBLIG - MS Rider	8,952	310	227,201	236,463		
CUST METERS INSTR TRANSF	6,723	3,203	0	9,926		
	34,051	19,729	644,167	697,947		
Check:						
Revenue Requirement by Old Class	\$22,040,896.20					
Revenue Requirement by New Class	\$22,060,488.39					

FINAL

16-Nov-01

PRIMARY DEMAND RATE - N4

INTERMEDIATE
SERV PRIMARY
RATE 21 DST
(11)
GENERAL
SERVICE PRI
RATE 13 DST
(8)

CLAIMED RATE OF RETURN SUMMARY SCHEDULE - COMPONENT FORMAT

RATE OF RETURN		9.84%	9.84%	DEVELOPMENT OF RATE	
REVENUES REQUIRED				CUSTOMER	DEMAND
1	DEMAND COMPONENTS	\$4,400,113	0		
2	DEMAND PRODUCTION	\$0	0		
3	DEMAND TRANSMISSION	\$0	0		
4	DEMAND TRANSMISSION OTHER	\$0	0		
5	DEMAND TRANSM LOAD DISPATCHING	\$0	0		
6	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION	\$4,400,113	0		
7	DEMAND SUBTRANSMISSION	\$471,349	1,423,235		1,894,584
8	DEMAND SUBTRANSM SUBSTATIONS	\$320,104	983,526		1,303,631
9	DEMAND DIRECT ASSIGN SUBSTATIONS	\$23,576	36,522		60,098
10	DEMAND DISTR PRIMARY SUBSTATIONS	\$606,713	1,989,161		2,595,874
11	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION PRIMARY	\$2,741,591	8,721,548		11,463,139
12	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION SECONDARY	\$0	0		0
13	DEMAND DISTRIB LOAD DISPATCHING	\$131,635	260,480		392,116
14	DEMAND DISTRIB ADD'L FACILITIES REV	(\$31,769)	(111,320)		(143,089)
15	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS	\$136,914	2,009,426		
16	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION SERVICES	\$0	0		
17	ENERGY COMPONENTS	\$0	0		
18	CUSTOMER COMPONENTS	\$407,937	0		
19	370 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - Cust Chrg	\$0	0	0	
	371 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - MS Rider	\$0	0		
20	370 - METERS SECONDARY - Cust Chrg	\$6,707	124,316	131,023	
	371 - METERS SECONDARY - MS Rider	\$7,526	139,443		
21	370 - METERS PRIMARY - Cust Chrg	\$7,317	1,665	8,982	
	371 - METERS PRIMARY - MS Rider	\$8,210	1,870		
22	370 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - Cust Chrg	\$0	0	0	
	371 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - MS Rider	\$0	0		
23	370 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - Cust Chrg	\$0	0	0	
	371 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - MS Rider	\$0	0		
24	370 - METERS TRANSMISSION - Cust Chrg	\$0	0	0	
	371 - METERS TRANSMISSION - MS Rider	\$0	0		
25	902 - METER READING - Cust Chrg	\$25,621	40,361	65,982	
	903 - METER READING - MS Rider	\$30,686	48,343		
26	903 - CUST RECORDS & COLL	\$93,747	245,136	338,883	
27	904 - UNCOLLECTIBLE ACCOUNTS	\$0	0	0	
28	908 - CUSTOMER ASSISTANCE	\$137,649	324,990	462,639	
29	909 - INFORMATION & INSTRUCT	\$0	0	0	
30	CUSTOMER BLACK START	\$7,116	14,323	21,439	
31	CUST MTR REG OBLIG - Customer Charge	\$776	67,838	68,614	
32	CUST MTR REG OBLIG - MS Rider	\$870	76,088		
	CUST METERS INSTR TRANSF	\$83,085	549,205		
33	CUST SERVICES	\$0	0	0	0
34	373 - STR LIGHT & OUTDOOR LIGHT	\$0	0		
35	CUSTOMER ADVANCES FOR CONSTR	\$0	(28,802)		(28,802)
36	CUSTOMER DEPOSITS	\$0	(0)		(0)
37	450 - LATE PAYMENT CHARGES	(\$1,371)	(12,487)		(13,858)
38					0
39	TOTAL COMPANY	\$4,808,050	\$16,904,869	\$822,960	\$17,523,692
40	ANNUAL BOOKED KWH SALES	531,100,888	1,036,014,295		
41	TOTAL ANNUAL BILLS	732	74,952	75,684	
42	BILLING DEMANDS	1,042,249	3,103,997		4,146,246
	Meters	69	6,246		
43	CUSTOMER CHARGE & DELIVERY CHARGE			\$10.87	\$4.23
	(WITHOUT METERING COSTS)			MONTHLY	\$/KW-BILLING
44	MONTHLY ACCESS CHARGE - Not Applicable				
	MONTHLY FACILITY CHARGE	\$ 2,146,341	0.52		
	Meter Services Rider Revenue Requirements:			\$/kw Total	
	371 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - MS Rider	0	0	0	
	371 - METERS SECONDARY - MS Rider	14,233	263,759	277,993	
	371 - METERS PRIMARY - MS Rider	15,527	3,536	19,063	
	371 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - MS Rider	0	0	0	
	371 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - MS Rider	0	0	0	
	371 - METERS TRANSMISSION - MS Rider	0	0	0	
	903 - METER READING - MS Rider	56,307	88,704	145,011	
	CUST MTR REG OBLIG - MS Rider	1,646	143,926	145,571	
	CUST METERS INSTR TRANSF	83,085	549,205	632,289	
		170,797	1,049,129	1,219,926	

Check:
Revenue Requirement by Old Class \$ 21,712,919
Revenue Requirement by New Class \$ 21,712,919

FINAL

16-Nov-01

SUBTRANSMISSION DEMAND RATE - N5

		INTERMEDIATE SERV SUBTRNS RATE 21 DST (12)	CONTRACT SUBTRANSM RATE 32 DST (17)	GENERAL SERVICE PRI RATE 13 DST (8)		
CLAIMED RATE OF RETURN SUMMARY SCHEDULE - COMPONENT FORMAT		Subtransmission				
RATE OF RETURN		9.84%	9.84%	9.84%	DEVELOPMENT OF RATE	
REVENUES REQUIRED					CUSTOMER	DEMAND
1	DEMAND COMPONENTS	\$1,084,019	\$56,776			
2	DEMAND PRODUCTION	\$0	\$0			
3	DEMAND TRANSMISSION	\$0	\$0			
4	DEMAND TRANSMISSION OTHER	\$0	\$0			
5	DEMAND TRANSM LOAD DISPATCHING	\$0	\$0			
6	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION	\$1,084,019	\$56,776			
7	DEMAND SUBTRANSMISSION	\$387,377	\$48,480	\$24,993		\$460,851
8	DEMAND SUBTRANSM SUBSTATIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0
9	DEMAND DIRECT ASSIGN SUBSTATIONS	\$581,815	\$0	\$54,783		\$0
10	DEMAND DISTR PRIMARY SUBSTATIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0
11	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION PRIMARY	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0
12	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION SECONDARY	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0
13	DEMAND DISTRIB LOAD DISPATCHING	\$118,477	\$8,295	\$4,574		\$131,347
14	DEMAND DISTRIB ADD'L FACILITIES REV	(\$3,651)	\$0	(\$1,955)		(\$5,606)
15	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION TRANSFORMERS	(\$0)	\$0	\$0		(\$0)
16	DEMAND DISTRIBUTION SERVICES	(\$0)	\$0	\$0		
17	ENERGY COMPONENTS	\$0	\$0			
18	CUSTOMER COMPONENTS	\$226,186	\$13,816			
19	370 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - Cust Chrg	(\$0)	\$0	\$0		
	371 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	\$0		
20	370 - METERS SECONDARY - Cust Chrg	\$407	\$0	\$0	407	
	371 - METERS SECONDARY - MS Rider	\$456	\$0	\$0		
21	370 - METERS PRIMARY - Cust Chrg	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	
	371 - METERS PRIMARY - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	\$0		
22	370 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - Cust Chrg	\$3,047	\$202	\$0	3,249	
	371 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - MS Rider	\$3,423	\$229	\$0		
23	370 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - Cust Chrg	\$407	\$0	\$0	407	
	371 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - MS Rider	\$456	\$0	\$0	0	
24	370 - METERS TRANSMISSION - Cust Chrg	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	
	371 - METERS TRANSMISSION - MS Rider	\$0	\$0	\$0		
25	902 - METER READING - Cust Chrg	\$7,057	\$371	\$13	7,441	
	903 - METER READING - MS Rider	\$8,448	\$444	\$15		
26	903 - CUST RECORDS & COLL	\$25,822	\$1,363	\$78	27,264	
27	904 - UNCOLLECTIBLE ACCOUNTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	
28	908 - CUSTOMER ASSISTANCE	\$123,593	\$8,652	\$104	132,349	
29	909 - INFORMATION & INSTRUCT	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	
30	CUSTOMER BLACK START	\$6,405	\$448	\$5	6,858	
31	CUST MTR REG OBLIG - Customer Charge	\$215	\$12	\$22	249	
	CUST MTR REG OBLIG - MS Rider	\$238	\$12	\$24		
32	CUST METERS INSTR TRANSF	\$46,214	\$2,082	\$176		
33	CUST SERVICES	\$0	\$0	\$0		
34	373 - STR LIGHT & OUTDOOR LIGHT	\$0	\$0	\$0		
35	CUSTOMER ADVANCES FOR CONSTR	\$0	\$0	(\$506)		(\$506)
36	CUSTOMER DEPOSITS	\$0	\$0	(\$0)		(\$0)
37	450 - LATE PAYMENT CHARGES	\$0	\$0	(\$219)		(\$219)
38						
39	TOTAL COMPANY	\$1,310,205	\$70,592	\$82,108	\$166,470	\$585,867
			\$0			
40	ANNUAL BOOKED KWH SALES	482,876,641	33,885,876	10,701,600		
41	TOTAL ANNUAL BILLS	204	12	24	240	
42	BILLING DEMANDS	893,452	125,917	64,496		1,083,865
43	CUSTOMER CHARGE (WITHOUT METERING COSTS)				\$693.63	\$0.54
45	MONTHLY FACILITIES CHARGE (subtransmission)	\$636,598			\$0.59	

Meter Services Rider Revenue Requirements:

	Total			
371 - METERS SINGLE PHASE SEC - MS Rider	0	0	0	0
371 - METERS SECONDARY - MS Rider	863	0	0	863
371 - METERS PRIMARY - MS Rider	0	0	0	0
371 - METERS PRIMARY SUBSTATION - MS Rider	6,470	431	0	6,901
371 - METERS SUBTRANSMISSION - MS Rider	863	0	0	863
371 - METERS TRANSMISSION - MS Rider	0	0	0	0
903 - METER READING - MS Rider	15,505	815	28	16,348
CUST MTR REG OBLIG - MS Rider	453	24	46	523
CUST METERS INSTR TRANSF	46,214	2,082	176	48,471
	70,366	3,352	250	73,969

Check:

Revenue Requirement by Old Class
Revenue Requirement by New Class

\$1,462,904
\$1,462,904

CILCO Meter Support
Worksheet
Revised

Docket Nos. 01-0465/01-0530/01-0637 (consol)
ICC Staff Exhibit 6.0
Schedule 4

CENTRAL ILLINOIS LIGHT COMPANY
Meter Support Worksheet

										94.31%									
	Quantity	Meter Cost	Meter Cost	Instrument Transformer	Allocator for Meter				Instrument Transformer Costs										
1 Single phase - class 100/200 - no demand	170,548	\$ 24.00	\$ 24.00	\$ -	\$ 3,860,251.65	54.64%	\$ 2,760,325.13	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
1 Single phase - class 320/400 - no demand	1,926	\$ 221.00	\$ 221.00	\$ -	\$ 401,426.74	5.68%	\$ 287,045.62	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
1 Single phase - class 200 fixed demand	3,369	\$ 24.00	\$ 24.00	\$ -	\$ 76,255.29	1.08%	\$ 54,527.38	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
1 Single phase controlled	8	\$ 230.00	\$ 230.00	\$ -	\$ 1,735.30	0.02%	\$ 1,240.85	\$ 3,103,138.98	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -			175,851	\$ 17.65	\$ 1.47			\$ 2.65
2 Three phase - self-contained (3 or 4 wire) - no demand	2,694	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ -	\$ 381,106.71	5.39%	\$ 272,515.50	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
2 Three phase - self-contained (3 or 4 wire)	-	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 272,515.50	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	-	2,694	\$ 101.16	\$ 8.43	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9.61
3 Three phase - class 200 - demand/tou	4,374	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ -	\$ 618,767.91	8.76%	\$ 442,458.36	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
3 Single phase 200 demand/tou	250	\$ 89.00	\$ 89.00	\$ -	\$ 20,983.98	0.30%	\$ 15,004.87	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
3 Single phase - class 320/400 - demand/tou	59	\$ 221.00	\$ 221.00	\$ -	\$ 12,297.08	0.17%	\$ 8,793.19	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
3 Single phase - class 200 - demand/tou	9,988	\$ 89.00	\$ 89.00	\$ -	\$ 838,351.77	11.87%	\$ 599,474.77	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
3 Single phase - class 320/400 - demand/tou	579	\$ 221.00	\$ 221.00	\$ -	\$ 120,678.13	1.71%	\$ 86,292.53	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
3 Single phase - class 200 - demand/tou	6	\$ 89.00	\$ 89.00	\$ -	\$ 503.62	0.01%	\$ 360.12	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
3 Three phase - class 320/400 - demand/tou	343	\$ 221.00	\$ 221.00	\$ -	\$ 71,489.81	1.01%	\$ 51,119.75	\$ 1,203,503.59	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	-	15,599	\$ 77.15	\$ 6.43	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7.61
4 Single phase - transformer rated - demand/tou (3 wire)	5	\$ 89.00	\$ 89.00	\$ -	\$ 419.68	0.01%	\$ 300.10	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -									
4 Three phase - transformer rated - demand/tou	66	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 354.00	\$ 9,336.69	0.13%	\$ 6,676.33	\$ 6,976.43	\$ 22,034.59	1.03%	\$ 6,679.13	\$ 6,679.13	71	\$ 98.26	\$ 8.19	\$ 94.07	\$ 7.84	\$ 17.21	
5 Three phase - transformer rated - 120/240 3 wire	66	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 354.00	\$ 9,336.69	0.13%	\$ 6,676.33	\$ 22,034.59	1.03%	\$ 6,679.13									
5 Three phase transformer rated - 120/208 4 wire	1	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 354.00	\$ 141.47	0.00%	\$ 101.16	\$ 333.86	0.02%	\$ 101.20									
5 Three phase - transformer rated - no demand (3 wire)	422	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 354.05	\$ 59,698.23	0.84%	\$ 42,688.03	\$ 140,907.72	6.61%	\$ 42,712.02									
5 Three phase - transformer rated - no demand (4 wire)	158	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 354.05	\$ 22,351.47	0.32%	\$ 15,982.72	\$ 52,756.92	2.47%	\$ 15,991.70									
5 Three phase - transformer rated - 120/240 3 wire	592	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 354.05	\$ 83,747.28	1.19%	\$ 59,884.62	\$ 197,671.50	9.27%	\$ 59,918.28									
5 Three phase transformer rated - 120/208 4 wire	2,468	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 354.05	\$ 349,135.62	4.94%	\$ 249,654.14	\$ 374,987.00	\$ 824,076.44	38.64%	\$ 249,794.44	\$ 381,875.90	3,773	\$ 99.39	\$ 8.28	\$ 101.21	\$ 8.43	\$ 17.90	
6 Three phase transformer rated - 480v 3 wire	99	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 644.45	\$ 14,005.04	0.20%	\$ 10,014.49	\$ 60,170.30	2.82%	\$ 18,238.85									
6 Three phase transformer rated - 277/480 4 wire	565	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 644.45	\$ 79,927.73	1.13%	\$ 57,153.40	\$ 343,396.15	16.10%	\$ 104,090.40									
6 Three phase transformer rated - 480v 3 wire	5	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 644.45	\$ 707.33	0.01%	\$ 505.78	\$ 3,038.90	0.14%	\$ 921.15									
6 Three phase transformer rated - 277/480 4 wire	147	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 644.45	\$ 20,795.36	0.29%	\$ 14,870.00	\$ 82,543.67	\$ 89,343.78	4.19%	\$ 27,081.93	\$ 150,332.33	816	\$ 101.16	\$ 8.43	\$ 184.23	\$ 15.35	\$ 24.97	
7 Three phase transformer rated - 5kv 3 wire	8	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 4,016.46	\$ 1,131.72	0.02%	\$ 809.25	\$ 30,303.39	1.42%	\$ 9,185.58									
7 Three phase transformer rated - 5kv 4 wire	20	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 5,273.35	\$ 2,829.30	0.04%	\$ 2,023.13	\$ 99,465.93	4.66%	\$ 30,150.16									
8 Three phase transformer rated - 15kv 3 wire	15	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 4,016.46	\$ 2,121.98	0.03%	\$ 1,517.35	\$ 56,818.85	2.66%	\$ 17,222.96									
8 Three phase transformer rated - 15kv 4 wire	39	\$ 150.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 5,176.83	\$ 5,517.14	0.08%	\$ 3,945.10	\$ 8,294.83	\$ 190,408.47	8.93%	\$ 57,716.70	\$ 114,275.40	82	\$ 101.16	\$ 8.43	\$ 1,393.60	\$ 116.13	\$ 125.75	
Total	198,820		\$ -		\$ 7,065,050.69	100%	\$ 5,051,960.00	\$ 5,051,960.00	\$ 2,132,761.38	100%	\$ 646,483.63	\$ 653,162.76	198,886						

Meters by Rate Class:

Rate 1	183,228
Rate 2	17,958
Rate 13	22,735
Rate 15	5
Rate 22	229
	<u>224,155</u>

Meter Reading \$ 2,825,670.00 \$ 14.21 \$ 1.18

RIDER MS: METERING SERVICE

CILCO Revised Exhibit 2.9

Docket Nos. 01-0465/01-0530/01-0637 (consol)**ICC Staff Exhibit 6.0****Schedule 5****(1) Availability**

This Rider is applicable to the Rate RDS, Residential Delivery Service and to Rate NDS, Non-Residential Delivery Service.

This Rider is applicable to new metering equipment to be installed by the Company after the effective date hereof, and is not a replacement for any lease or rental the customer may have for existing metering equipment.

2) Nature of Service

Meters will be installed in accordance with the Company's standard practices. Typically, residential and small commercial customers served at secondary voltages, and billed on either a KWH or KW basis, will be charged for non-transformer rated metering. Customers served at higher voltages than secondary service will typically be charged for instrument transformation metering. Interval metering is required as a standard for all accounts for which demands are greater than 1,000 Kva.

Rate RDS and Rate NDS customers requesting non-typical meter configurations for their rate, or customers requiring non-typical meter configurations based on their load characteristics will be charged based on actual meter configuration in service.

Service hereunder is subject to the Company's General Terms and Conditions for Electric Service.

(3) Rates and Charges

Customers taking standard Metering Service under this Rider shall be charged a monthly charge per meter as outlined below:

Issued - _____, 2002, pursuant to ICC
Order entered _____, 2002, in Docket
Nos. 01-0637/01-0530/01-0465 (Cons.)

Effective - May 1, 2002

Issued by - R. J. Sprowls, President
Peoria, Illinois

CILCO Response to Staff Data Request DLS-11

DLS-11 In regard to CILCO Schedule C-1, Total Operating Revenues are listed as \$112,912,000. However, CILCO's cost of service study uses a figure of \$109,200,000. Please explain this discrepancy and provide documentation showing how these figures are used to arrive at CILCO's proposed DST rates and charges.

Response: The cost of service study shows the total operating revenues of \$109,190,917 which represents the operating revenues for electric distribution services of \$108,335,533 plus the other operating revenues related to electric distribution services of \$855,383. The Company's total operating revenues of \$109,190,917 are before adjustment for the pro-forma adjustments and the Company's full requested return of 9.84%.

At the Company's requested rate of return of 9.84%, the revenue requirement for the electric distribution delivery services for retail is \$111,928,152 and the revenue requirement for the electric distribution delivery services for wholesale is \$129,202 which results in a revenue requirement for electric distribution delivery services of \$112,057,354. Combined with the other revenues for electric distribution services of \$855,383, the total electric distribution revenues are \$112,912,737.

CENTRAL ILLINOIS LIGHT COMPANY

Residential Delivery Services - Docket No. 01-0637
Response to Staff Data Request DLS-11 through DLS-20

DLS-13 In regard to CILCO's cost of service study, please provide a definition of the distribution functional category labeled "customer meter regulatory obligation". Was this category used in CILCO's 1999 DST cost of service study? Why or why not?

Response: The functional category for customer meter regulatory obligation represents an allocation of the costs related to the investments remaining on the records of the Company, for customers where their meter has been removed, as it relates to providing metering services. The Company did not file a 1999 DST cost of service study – the Company filed a 1997 test year for the last DST filing. The allocation of these costs was changed in the Company's Errata filing based upon input from the ICC Staff expressing concern over this allocation methodology.

Prepared by: V. Bilsland

CENTRAL ILLINOIS LIGHT COMPANY

Residential Delivery Services - Docket No. 01-0637
Response to Staff Data Request DLS-11 through DLS-20

DLS-14 Why are the costs associated with “customer meter regulatory obligation ” recovered in customer charges? Why aren’t the costs recovered in meter charges? What would be the result of recovering such costs in meter service rates in Rider MS? How would Rider MS rates be affected?

Response: It is appropriate to recover costs related to the investments remaining on the Company’s books from the customer who caused those costs to be incurred. When the Company removes its meter from a customer’s premises, the capitalized costs for installation remains on the Company’s books until the meter is retired. When the meter is removed, it is put into inventory. Under the Customer Choice Law, the Company is required to stand ready to provide standard metering services. 220 ILCS Section 16-102. Definitions. “Delivery services” means those services provided by the electric utility that are necessary in order for the transmission and distribution system to function so that retail customers located in the electric utility’s service area can receive electric power and energy from suppliers other than the electric utility, and shall include, without limitation, standard metering and billing services. This obligation to serve the standard metering requirements should be recovered from all customers.

Under the Company’s Errata filing, the methodology for recovering costs for metering assets remaining on the Company’s books was revised. The capitalized installation costs were removed along with the capitalized meter costs. These costs plus assigned metering services expenses and related meter reading costs plus overhead were put into the Company’s M S Rider to represent the costs the customer would not have to pay CILCO if they chose another meter service provider. The assignment of these costs properly reflect the Commission Third Interim Order for Docket #99-0013.

Prepared by: V. Bilsland